

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for comparing an identifier for said external component with an identifier for said integrated component. Thus, there is a component integrated within a platform and a component external to the platform. They each have identifiers which are compared.

The office action, on page 5, indicates that the cited reference to Papa does compare identifiers (1) since a device's configuration registers must be initialized and I/O address ranges assigned and (2) the bridge is programmed to pass any transaction detected on the primary side of the bridge to the secondary side if the target address is within the assigned range.


It is respectfully submitted that, even if the two points made above were true, they do not inherently or explicitly involve comparing an identifier for said external component with an identifier for the integrated component. With respect to the first point, suppose that the device's configuration registers are initialized and I/O addresses assigned. There is still no comparison of external and integrated component addresses. With respect to the second point, assuming the bridge is programmed to pass any transaction detected on the primary side of the bridge to the secondary side if the target address is within the assigned range, there still need not be any comparison between the identifiers for the external and integrated components.

In order to be inherent pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2112, the Papa reference must necessarily perform in the claimed way. There is no reason that Papa compares external component and integrated component identifiers.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2004



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]